

The Democratic package was the better of the two. It was much less expensive in the outyears, better targeted to the middle class, and it provided significant tax relief for families and their education expenses. Education is a key investment in our young people's future, but it currently is one of the least favored areas in the tax code.

so overall I voted for this tax cut package in order to move the process along, with the hope of improving it as it moves through the next stages of the legislative process. Improvements in the bill can yet be made in a joint House-Senate conference committee by targeting more of the cuts to moderate-income families; reducing its outyear costs; simplifying it so we don't greatly increase the complexity of the tax code; and providing that if for some reason we won't be reaching a balanced budget by 2002, then some of the tax cuts should be trimmed back.

In short, I support a balanced budget plan. Although tax cuts should not be our top priority, the issue today is not whether to cut taxes, but who gets the tax cuts. My view is that the Republican bill disproportionately benefits the rich. We need to better target tax cuts to moderate-income families and capital gains and estate tax reductions to small businesses and family farms. I have been most uneasy about the pattern of this and the previous Congress to cut programs for the poor and provide tax cuts for the rich. That is the wrong legacy to leave, and the wrong way to balance the budget.

DR. CARIDAD PEREZ: EDUCATOR  
AND HUMANITARIAN

**HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Dr. Caridad Perez for all of the stellar and selfless years of work that she has dedicated to south Florida's children. As an educator by occupation, I have known Dr. Perez for many years and have seen the positive outcome of all of her efforts.

After arriving in the United States upon fleeing the Castro regime, Dr. Perez wasted no time in dedicating herself to doing what she does best, educating children. Twenty-eight years ago she founded Edison Private School, starting with only one student. Today, Edison Private School has many alumni who went on to pursue different careers and are now successful members of south Florida's community.

In addition to running Edison Private School, Dr. Perez has made a great name for herself in the business community. She is the president of three different corporations; a real estate company and a business geared toward school transportation, in addition to her school. For her great success in the business world, she was recognized as Businesswoman of the Year by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1993.

Perhaps one of Dr. Perez's greatest achievements has been her work and dedication toward helping children through UNICEF. She serves as the honorary chairman and member at large of the Greater Miami Committee For UNICEF.

I applaud Dr. Perez for her determination to get ahead, her discipline to persevere and her selfless dedication to those children who are in need of a leader and savior.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1997, I attended the NATO Summit as one of four Members of the House of Representatives in the American delegation. As a result, I missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 246, H.R. 849—"yea"; rollcall No. 247, Senate Joint Resolution 29—"yea"; rollcall No. 248, H.R. 1658—"yea"; and rollcall No. 250, H.R. 2016—"yea."

## STAND DOWN '97

**HON. ELTON GALLEGLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an extraordinary group of people dedicated to an honorable cause, our veterans. Each year for the past 5 years, Stand Down, a comprehensive program designed to help homeless veterans reenter mainstream society, offers a 3-day program to provide the services necessary to help veterans achieve this assimilation. This year, Stand Down '97 will be held July 25–27 in Ventura, CA.

Stand Down provides a wide range of services to homeless veterans including medical and legal assistance, employment counseling, mental health services, financial counseling, personal hygiene, substance abuse counseling, AIDS stress and information on exposure to agent orange. The veterans also receive donated shoes, clothing, shelter, food and are treated to performances by the USO.

Since the program began in 1993, over 700 veterans have been assisted in Ventura County through the tireless efforts of volunteers and the executive committee. I would like to take the opportunity to commend the organizers of this program. They are: Clair Hope, Sharon Dwyer, Judge John Dobroth, Jim Grunnert, Jean Farley, Mary Fielder, Todd Howeth, Dwayne Dammeyer, J. Rogers Myers, Kevin Sheahan, Kathy Swaim, Bob Reeves, Rick Brandeberg, Stephen K. Davis, Robert Guillen, Hal Nachenberg, Dr. Philip Loring, Patricia Knight, Evelyn Burge, Betty Zamost, Patrick Zarate, Colleen Kelly, Joseph Narkevitz, Robert Reed, Aubrey Towler, Mike McKelroy, Earl Dunavan, Volney Dunavan, Dr. Bob Delzell, Bill Schmidt, Mike Silkwood, Bob Adams, Dr. Cal Farmer, Jeannette Villanueva-Walker, Sonja Musgrove, Madeline Lee, Sue Duffy, Charles Lowrance, Marie Williams, Nancy Joseph, Gene Ogden, and Francisco Gamboa.

I offer my sincere thanks and congratulations to each of the volunteers and executive committee members. Their commitment to our veterans is a tremendous contribution to our community and a much needed helping hand to our veterans.

## A SALUTE TO SOME UNSUNG HEROS

**HON. SCOTT L. KLUG**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues: I would like to call your attention to a great service rendered to this country by the men who served as civilian weather observers with the U.S. Weather Bureau's North Atlantic Patrol during the Second World War. These men significantly impacted the success of D-Day, and many other battles of World War II, and yet, they have never been given the public appreciation they so richly deserve.

One of my constituents, Mr. Ray McCool, told me of these men, serving in the North Atlantic Weather Patrol aboard Coast Guard vessels, who obtained and transmitted essential weather data to Washington, DC. As a result, they made possible the preparation of weather maps used throughout the war. In fact, their long-range forecasts provided vital information needed to plan the D-Day invasion. Their knowledge and talents made an enormous difference in the success of the overall mission and ultimately in an allied victory.

Their service was not without danger and sacrifice. Under the Geneva Convention articles of War, the rules for treating military prisoners did not apply to civilians. Therefore capture by the enemy most likely meant being treated as a spy and shot. To prevent this, they were outfitted in Coast Guard uniforms, carried as chief petty officers and enlisted into the service as "U.S. Coast Guard Temporary Reserves."

If capture by the enemy wasn't worry enough, they had the high seas and enemy ships to face. A typical mission took these men out to sea for 4 to 6 weeks at a time where they dealt with hurricanes and attacks from depth charges, U-boats, and German submarines.

To date, the United States has never fully recognized the invaluable job these civilian weather observers performed.

Today, let the record show we salute these unsung heroes and acknowledge their service to our Nation. Further, in order to show our proper recognition, I am recommending that each local veteran's office present a U.S. flag to the family of a deceased member of this elite ensemble of men. In the face of danger and against the odds, these men stood tall and answered our country's call to freedom, and for that the United States of America is forever grateful.

## TRIBUTE TO KFMO RADIO OF PARK HILLS, MO

**HON. JO ANN EMERSON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to KFMO Radio of Park Hills, MO. A friend to the Eighth Congressional District, KFMO recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

The first radio station in Park Hills, KFMO began serving the folks of Park Hills, MO, on

July 4, 1947. At that time, the radio station was owned by Hirsch Broadcasting Corp.

From the time of the forty's when radio was king through today, KFMO remains one of the most vibrant and energetic stations in the area. KFMO is part of the Parklands Information System and carries extensive news coverage throughout the day. With the Parkland Today Show, the senior's lunch menu, obits, and tons of local news, folk in St. Francois County know that if it is happening locally, it's happening on KFMO.

In 1992, KFMO was acquired and is currently owned by Hirsch Broadcasting Co. Under the leadership of President M. L. Steinmetz and Larry D. Joseph, vice president/general manager, M.K.S. Broadcasting also own and operates B104 FM radio which is also in Park Hills.

Mr. Speaker, with so many people in so many different areas dependent upon the folks at KFMO for their information, I am pleased to wish them a happy 50th anniversary. I salute their commitment to the community and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing the folks at KFMO all the best for another 50 years of success and service.

#### THE SUPREME COURT

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 9, 1997, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### THE SUPREME COURT

The U.S. Supreme Court recently completed its 1996-1997 term with a flurry of landmark opinions on a wide range of issues, including assisted suicide, religious freedom and the Brady gun law. This term of the Court showed the extraordinary role and power of the Supreme Court in redesigning the institutions of our government and in allocating power among them. With unusual assertiveness and confidence, the Court struck down three federal laws in a single day and sided against the White House on cases involving Paula Jones and Whitewater.

The Court, particularly its conservative majority, has strongly-held views about the structure of our constitutional form of government, and is not afraid to exercise judicial authority to that end. Restraining federal power is one overarching theme in the Court's decisions this term. The Court struck several blows for states' rights at the expense of Congress, limited claims of immunity by the White House, and even acted to curtail federal judicial authority in certain matters.

The Court continues to be narrowly divided on many issues. Seventeen cases were decided by 5-to-4 votes. The conservative justices—Rehnquist, Scalia, Thomas, O'Connor, and Kennedy—voted together on many of the key decisions, including the decision overturning the Brady gun law. But this term lacked the rancorous debate of previous years, and the Court was surprisingly united on several important cases, including the two decisions rejecting a constitutional right to assisted suicide.

What follows is a summary of the major decisions this term:

#### ASSISTED SUICIDE

In perhaps the most anticipated decisions of the term, the Court rejected claims that

there was a constitutional right to assisted suicide. The Court held that the states may bar or allow assisted suicide as they choose. Currently, only one state, Oregon, allows assisted suicide. The decision was also significant in that the Court declined to involve itself in a difficult social issue, deferring instead to state legislatures.

#### FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

The Court also addressed fundamental questions about the distribution of power between states and the federal government. The conservative majority has acted in recent years to curb the reach of federal authority, particularly when it may intrude on state powers. In 1995, for example, the Court overturned a federal law banning gun possession within 1000 feet of a school.

The Court struck two more blows for states' rights this term. First, the Court invalidated provisions of the Brady gun law which required local law enforcement officials to conduct background checks on prospective handgun purchasers. The Court said that Congress cannot "drag" state and local officials into administering or enforcing a federal regulatory program. The effect of the decision will likely be limited because most states, including Indiana, also require background checks, and because the Brady law's five-day waiting period for gun purchases remains intact. Second, the Court invalidated the Religious Freedom Act which aimed to protect religious practices from government interference. The Court ruled that Congress has the authority to enforce constitutional rights, but not, as in this case, to make a substantive change in the meaning of the Constitution. The Court stressed that it, and not Congress, has that responsibility. The decision makes it easier for state and local authorities to pass laws of general applicability, such as zoning restrictions, even if those laws have the incidental effect of burdening a religious practice.

#### PRESIDENTIAL POWER

The Court decided several important cases relating to Presidential power. First, the Court unanimously rejected the President's request for delay in the Paula Jones lawsuit until he leaves office. The civil suit involving alleged sexual harassment while the President was Governor of Arkansas must now go forward. Second, the Court refused to consider a White House claim that attorney-client privilege attached to notes taken by White House lawyers during conversations with Hillary Clinton about the Whitewater matter. The White House has now turned over the notes to Whitewater prosecutor Ken Starr. Third, and in a partial victory for the President, the Court rejected a challenge to the line-item veto law, which gives the President authority to strike certain provisions from spending and tax measures. The Court said that the members of Congress who brought the suit did not have "standing" to sue, which means that the Court will not address the merits of the claim until the President actually exercises the line-item veto.

#### FREE SPEECH RIGHTS

The Court handed down important decisions relating to the First Amendment. First, the Court invalidated a federal law which made it a crime to knowingly send or display indecent material over the Internet, where children can see it. The Court unanimously said that the law would suppress too much speech among Internet users. Second, the Court permitted public schoolteachers to provide remedial help to students at parochial schools. The Court had previously held that public funds could not be spent in this way without violating the separation between church and state.

#### CRIMINAL LAW

The Court upheld a Kansas law which permits states to confine certain violent sex offenders in mental hospitals after they have served their criminal sentences. The Court also made it easier for police to conduct car searches during routine traffic stops.

#### CONCLUSION

The Court's major decisions this term aim to restrain the exercise of federal power, particularly by Congress. For a Court that often preaches judicial restraint, it did not hesitate to exercise extraordinary judicial power. The practical effect of the Court's decisions on future congressional action, however, is uncertain. The states and the public continue to look to Washington for guidance, money, and leadership on many issues, including health care, environmental protection and law enforcement. Congress, I suspect, will continue to pass laws which impose some burdens on the states, perhaps as a condition of receiving federal funding or in some other manner consistent with the recent Court decisions. But, in doing so, Congress will know that the Court is a strong proponent of states' rights and is scrutinizing its every move.

#### DEFENSE INDUSTRY INITIATIVE ON BUSINESS ETHICS AND CONDUCT

#### HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1997

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Defense Industry Initiative on Business Ethics and Conduct for its 11 years of active effort in creating high standards of business ethics, business conduct, and compliance in the defense industry. I know that many Members of the House are not familiar with this unique effort, known as the DII.

The DII was created in 1986 as an outgrowth of the work of the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, known as the Packard Commission. At that time, a number of leading defense contractors drafted a set of DII principles. These principles obligated signatory companies to have written codes of conduct, to distribute the codes to all of their employees, to have ethics training programs which made certain that employees understood the codes, to have a hotline or ombudsman system, to have systems to make voluntary disclosures of violations of law or regulation to the Government, to attend annual best practices forums, and to participate in a public accountability process.

The group of signatory companies has grown over these 11 years to 48 companies, including virtually all of the largest defense contractors. Frankly, I would think that all of our 100 largest defense contractors, at least, should be willing to sign up publicly to the Defense Industry Initiative Principles. And I call upon those companies that are among this group which, for whatever reason, are not presently signatories to sign this statement in order to pledge themselves to the Defense Department and to the public as being committed to these ideals.

Recently, the DII conducted its 12th Best Practices Forum. This session was held on